



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

| APPLICATION NO. | FILING DATE | FIRST NAMED INVENTOR | ATTORNEY DOCKET NO. | CONFIRMATION NO. |
|-----------------|-------------|--------------------------|---------------------|------------------|
| 10/808,645 | 03/24/2004 | William Michael McCardle | 200600376-1 | 6121 |

22879 7590 10/31/2006

HEWLETT PACKARD COMPANY
P O BOX 272400, 3404 E. HARMONY ROAD
INTELLECTUAL PROPERTY ADMINISTRATION
FORT COLLINS, CO 80527-2400

EXAMINER

TRAN, NGHI V

ART UNIT PAPER NUMBER

2151

DATE MAILED: 10/31/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

10/808,645

Applicant(s)

MCCARDLE ET AL.

Examiner

Nghi V. Tran

Art Unit

2151

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 24 March 2004.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-27 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 101

1. 35 U.S.C. 101 reads as follows:

Whoever invents or discovers any new and useful process, machine, manufacture, or composition of matter, or any new and useful improvement thereof, may obtain a patent therefor, subject to the conditions and requirements of this title.

2. Claims 21-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because of the following reasons:

3. Claim 21 is directly not limited to “functional descriptive material” because claim 21 is directly and/or indirectly to a computer program and/or a computer software application such as a graphical user interface. According to “Patent Eligibility Guidelines 35 USC 101”, pages 50-51, and according to MPEP 2106 page 2100-2012, a computer program is directed to non-statutory subject matter. For example, the Interim Guidelines recites “When functional descriptive material is recorded on some computer-readable medium it becomes structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium and will be statutory...” On the other hand, the claim 21 recites “A graphical user interface operable to: ...” (emphasis added) are directed to non-statutory subject matter because claim 21 is just limited to computer program and computer application per se, instead being defined as including structurally and functionally interrelated to the medium. Further, claim 21 lacks structurally and functionally to recorded on some computer-readable medium. Therefore, claim 21 is directed to non-statutory subject matter because they are not directly to “functional descriptive material”.

4. Claims 22-26 are also rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because they are directly on independent claim 21.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(e) the invention was described in (1) an application for patent, published under section 122(b), by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent or (2) a patent granted on an application for patent by another filed in the United States before the invention by the applicant for patent, except that an international application filed under the treaty defined in section 351(a) shall have the effects for purposes of this subsection of an application filed in the United States only if the international application designated the United States and was published under Article 21(2) of such treaty in the English language.

6. Claims 1, 11, 21, and 27 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(e) as being anticipated by Zimmer et al., United States Patent Number 7,051,215 (hereinafter Zimmer).

7. With respect to claims 1, 11, 21, and 27, Zimmer teaches a method of compute clustering [see abstract and figs.1-3], comprising:

- identifying a defined cluster [col.1, ln.45 through col.2, ln.30], the cluster including a plurality of receptors [i.e. an interface plane **104** such as backplane and/or mid-plane, col.3, lns.62-66] in a chassis [i.e. rack mounted chassis **100**], each receptor configured to couple the chassis to a network device [i.e. blades **102** and/or **200**, figs.1-2], at least one of the plurality of

Art Unit: 2151

receptors in the cluster being unoccupied by a network device [i.e. all slots in a chassis do not need to be occupied, col.3, Ins.58-62];

- storing the physical locations [i.e. blade ID such as blade 1-N and/or MAC address, col.10, Ins.60-67] associated with each of the plurality of receptors [fig.6 and col.10, Ins.60-67]; and
- wherein storing the physical locations includes storing the physical location associated with the at least one receptor in the cluster that is unoccupied by a network device [col.12, Ins.31-53 and col.3, Ins.58-62].

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 2-6, 12-16, and 22-26 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zimmer as applied to claims 1, 11, and 21 above, in view of Rothman et al., United States Patent Application Publication Number 2004/0109406 (hereinafter Rothman).

10. With respect to claims 2, 12, and 22, Zimmer further teaches receiving an image designated as a default image for the plurality of receptors in the cluster.

In a clustered servers method, Rothman suggests or discloses receiving an image designated as a default image for the plurality of receptors in the cluster [fig.2 and paragraphs 0014-0019].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Zimmer in view of Rothman by receiving an image designated as a default image for the plurality of receptors in the cluster because this feature may be responsible for providing configuration information or target operating system information to facilitate booting [Rothman, paragraph 0014]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated in order to enable cluster of server to handle defects that occur in one or more of the servers in the cluster [Rothman, paragraph 0006].

11. With respect to claims 3, 13, and 23, Zimmer does not explicitly show associating the default image with the at least one receptor in the cluster that is unoccupied by a network device.

In a clustered servers method, Rothman suggests or discloses associating the default image with the at least one receptor in the cluster that is unoccupied by a network device [fig.2 and paragraphs 0014-0019].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Zimmer in view of Rothman by associating the default image with the at least one receptor in the cluster that is unoccupied by a network device because this feature may be responsible for providing configuration

Art Unit: 2151

information or target operating system information to facilitate booting [Rothman, paragraph 0014]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated in order to enable cluster of server to handle defects that occur in one or more of the servers in the cluster [Rothman, paragraph 0006].

12. With respect to claims 4, 14, and 24, Zimmer does not explicitly show wherein the image comprises a physical location identifying software that operates to configure the plurality of receptors in the cluster.

In a clustered servers method, Rothman suggests or discloses wherein the image comprises a physical location identifying software that operates to configure the plurality of receptors in the cluster [fig.2 and paragraphs 0022-0027].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Zimmer in view of Rothman by operating to configure the plurality of receptors in the cluster via a physical location identifying software because this feature may be responsible for providing configuration information or target operating system information to facilitate booting [Rothman, paragraph 0014]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated in order to enable cluster of server to handle defects that occur in one or more of the servers in the cluster [Rothman, paragraph 0006].

13. With respect to claims 5, 15, and 25, Zimmer does not explicitly show receiving a designation that a selected one of the plurality of receptors is a master receptor and receiving an image designated as a master image for the selected receptor [figs.2-3 and paragraphs 0014-0029].

In a clustered servers method, Rothman suggests or discloses receiving a designation that a selected one of the plurality of receptors is a master receptor [i.e. proxy blade]; and receiving an image designated as a master image for the selected receptor [figs.2-3 and paragraphs 0014-0029].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Zimmer in view of Rothman by receiving an image designated as a master image for selected receptor because this feature may be responsible for providing configuration information or target operating system information to facilitate booting [Rothman, paragraph 0014]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated in order to enable cluster of server to handle defects that occur in one or more of the servers in the cluster [Rothman, paragraph 0006].

14. With respect to claims 6, 16, and 26, Zimmer does not explicitly show wherein the master image comprises a physical location identifying software that operates to configure the selected receptor.

In a clustered servers method, Rothman suggests or discloses wherein the master image comprises a physical location identifying software that operates to configure the selected receptor [fig.2 and paragraphs 0022-0027].

Therefore, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Zimmer in view of Rothman by operating to configure the selected receptor via a physical location identifying software because this feature may be responsible for providing configuration information or target operating system information to facilitate booting [Rothman, paragraph 0014]. It is for this reason that one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention would have been motivated in order to enable cluster of server to handle defects that occur in one or more of the servers in the cluster [Rothman, paragraph 0006].

15. Claims 7-10 and 17-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Zimmer, as applied to claims 1 and 11 above, in view of Rothman.

16. With respect to claims 7-10 and 17-20, Zimmer further teaches detecting the presence of a network device coupled to the at least one receptor in the cluster that was previously unoccupied; and in response to detecting the presence [col.3, ln.54 through col.4, ln.42].

However, Zimmer in view of Rothman does not explicitly show automatically installing an image on the network device; providing message the user with the option of

installing a default image on the network device; and overriding the image by installing the default image on the network device.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to modify Zimmer in view of Rothman by automatically installing an image on the network device; providing message the user with the option of installing a default image on the network device; and overriding the image by installing the default image on the network device.

Conclusion

17. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

a. "OS agnostic resource sharing across multiple computing platforms," by Rothman et al., United States Patent Application Publication Number 2005/0015430.

18. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Nghi V. Tran whose telephone number is (571) 272-4067. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Thursday and every other Friday (6:30-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Zarni Maung can be reached on (571) 272-3939. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2151

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

Nghi V Tran
Patent Examiner
Art Unit 2151

October 20, 2006

A handwritten signature in black ink, appearing to read 'Rupal Dharia', with a stylized, flowing script.

RUPAL DHARIA
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER